

Recall: for  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , defn for each  $r > 0$ ,

$$f^r(x) := \frac{1}{m(B_r(x))} \int_{B_r(x)} |f - f(x)| dm, \quad f^0(x) := \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} f^r(x).$$

Want to prove: Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $f^0(x) < \varepsilon \quad \forall x$  outside a set of measure  $< \varepsilon$ .

( $\Rightarrow f^0 = 0$  a.e., i.e. Lebesgue diff. thm.)

Choose seq of continuous fns  $f_k \xrightarrow{L^1} f$ , then

$$f^r(x) \leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{m(B_r(x))} \int_{B_r(x)} |f - f_k| dm}_{=: A} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{m(B_r(x))} \int_{B_r(x)} |f_k - f_k(x)| dm}_{=: B} + \underbrace{|f_k(x) - f(x)|}_{=: C}$$

Continuity  $\Rightarrow$  given  $k$ ,  $\forall x$  a all  $r > 0$  suff. small,  $B < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ .

claim: If  $k$  large enough s.t.  $\|f_k - f\|_{L^1}$  is suff. small, then

$\forall r > 0$ ,  $A, C < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \quad \forall x$  outside a set of measure  $< \varepsilon$ .

pf for C: Let  $g := f_k - f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ; for  $t > 0$ ,  $A_t := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |g(x)| > t\}$ ,

$$\text{then } \|g\|_{L^1} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |g(x)| dx \geq \int_{A_t} |g(x)| dx > t m(A_t)$$

$$\Rightarrow m(\{x; |g(x)| > t\}) \leq \frac{\|g\|_{L^1}}{t} \quad \text{"Chebyshev's ineq."}$$

Now set  $t := \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ , then  $|f_k(x) - f(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$  outside a set of measure

$$\leq \frac{3\|f_k - f\|_{L^1}}{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon \quad \text{if we choose } k \text{ large s.t. } \|f_k - f\|_{L^1} < \frac{\varepsilon^2}{3}.$$

pf for A:

defn: For  $g \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the maximal fn of  $g$  is  $Mg: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,

$$Mg(x) := \sup_{r > 0} \frac{1}{m(B_r(x))} \int_{B_r(x)} |g| dm$$

defn: For  $g: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measurable,

$$\|g\|_{L^1_{weak}} := \sup_{t > 0} t \cdot m(\{x; |g(x)| > t\}) = \inf \{C > 0 \mid m(\{x; |g(x)| > t\}) \leq \frac{C}{t} \quad \forall t > 0\}.$$

If  $\|g\|_{L^1_{weak}} < \infty$ , we say  $g$  is weakly integrable.

Caution:  $\|\cdot\|_{L^1_{weak}}$  does not satisfy  $\Delta$ -ineq; not a norm!

thm (Hardy-Littlewood maximal ineq.):  $\exists C > 0$  dep. only on  $n$  s.t.

$$\|Mg\|_{L^1_{weak}} \leq C \|g\|_{L^1} \quad \forall g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

con:  $\|f_k - f\|_{L^1}$  suff. small  $\Rightarrow \|M(f_k - f)\|_{L^1_{weak}}$  arbitrarily small

$$\Rightarrow M(f_k - f)(x) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \quad \forall x \text{ outside a set of measure } \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

remaining goal ("step 2" in FTC):  $F: [a, b] \rightarrow V$  abs. contin.  $\Rightarrow$

$$F(x) = c + \int_a^x f(t) dt \quad \text{for some const. } c \in V \text{ \& } f \in L^1([a, b]).$$

related Q: On a measure space  $(X, \mu)$ , which measures  $\lambda$  on the same  $\sigma$ -algebra can be expressed as  $\lambda(A) = \int_A f d\mu$  for some measurable  $f: X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ?

defn: When this holds, call  $f =: \frac{d\lambda}{d\mu}$  the "Radon-Nikodym derivative" of  $\lambda$  wrt.  $\mu$ .

necessary cond.:  $\mu(A) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda(A) = 0 \quad \forall A$ .

defn: If this holds, we say  $\lambda$  is absolutely continuous wrt.  $\mu$  (" $\lambda \ll \mu$ ")

ex. On  $\mathbb{R}$ , Dirac measure  $\delta(A) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \notin A \end{cases}$ , then  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\delta = f(0) \quad \forall f$

then  $\delta \ll \mu \Rightarrow \nexists$  "Dirac  $\delta$ -fn" satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\delta = f(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \underbrace{\delta(x)}_{\substack{\text{R-N deriv} \\ \text{of } \delta \text{ wrt. } \mu}} dx$

Radon-Nikodym Thm: If  $\mu$  \&  $\lambda$  are  $\sigma$ -finite measures

on the same  $\sigma$ -algebra, then  $\lambda \ll \mu \Leftrightarrow \exists$  a R-N deriv.  $\frac{d\lambda}{d\mu}$ .

relation to FTC: Assume  $F: [a, b] \rightarrow V$  abs. contin.

case 1:  $F: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is strictly increasing.

EX:  $\forall A \subseteq [a, b]$  with  $m(A) = 0$ ,  $m(F(A)) = 0$ . (recall: false for Cantor fn.)

$\Rightarrow \lambda(A) := m(F(A))$  defines a measure on  $[a, b]$  s.t.  $\lambda \ll m$

(e.g. strictly increasing  $\Rightarrow$  for  $A_1, A_2, \dots \subseteq [a, b]$  disjoint,  $F(A_1), F(A_2), \dots$  also disjoint)

$$\Rightarrow \lambda\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j\right) = m\left(F\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j\right)\right) = m\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} F(A_j)\right) = \sum_j m(F(A_j)) = \sum_j \lambda(A_j)$$

R.-N.  $\Rightarrow \exists$  measurable fn.  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  s.t.  $\forall A \subseteq [a, b]$ ,

$$\lambda(A) = m(F(A)) = \int_A f \, dm. \quad \text{In particular, } A := [a, x] \Rightarrow$$

$$m(F([a, x])) = F(x) - F(a) = \int_{[a, x]} f \, dm = \int_a^x f(t) \, dt.$$

$$\text{Since } \int_a^b f(t) \, dt = F(b) - F(a), \quad f \in L^1([a, b]).$$

case 2:  $F: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  increasing but not strictly.

Let  $G(x) := x + F(x)$ , then  $G$  is strictly incr. & abs. contin., apply case 1.

case 3: Lemma:  $F: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is abs. contin.  $\Leftrightarrow F = F_+ - F_-$  for 2 increasing abs. contin. fn.  $F_{\pm}$ .

(key word: "bounded variation")

general case:  $F: [a, b] \rightarrow V$  reduces to case  $V = \mathbb{R}$  (case 3) by choosing a basis of  $V$ . □

pf of Radon-Nikodym: Assume  $\lambda \ll \mu$  on  $X$ .

idea: If  $\exists f := \frac{d\lambda}{d\mu}$ , then  $g \in L^1(X, \lambda) \Rightarrow \int_X g d\lambda = \int_X g f d\mu$  (1)

For  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued fns.  $g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lambda + \mu$  is also a measure on  $X$ ,  $\exists$  a  
 odd linear fcn  $\Lambda: L^1(X, \lambda + \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Lambda(g) := \int_X g d\lambda$ : odd since  
 $|\Lambda(g)| = \left| \int_X g d\lambda \right| \leq \int_X |g| d\lambda \leq \int_X |g| d\lambda + \int_X |g| d\mu = \int_X |g| d(\lambda + \mu) = \|g\|_{L^1(\lambda + \mu)}$

Recall  $\Rightarrow \exists h \in L^\infty(X, \lambda + \mu)$  s.t.  $\|h\|_{L^\infty} = 1$  &  $\int_X g d\lambda = \int_X h g d(\lambda + \mu)$  (2)  
 $\forall g \in L^1(X, \lambda + \mu)$

If (1) also holds, then  $\forall g \in L^1(X, \lambda + \mu)$ ,

$$\int_X g f d\mu = \int_X g d\lambda = \int_X h g d\lambda + \int_X h g d\mu \stackrel{(1)}{=} \int_X (h g f + h g) d\mu = \int_X h g (1+f) d\mu$$

this suggests defining  $f$  s.t.  $f = h(1+f)$ , i.e.  $f = \frac{h}{1-h}$

Claim: If  $\lambda \ll \mu$ , then  $\frac{h}{1-h} = \frac{d\lambda}{d\mu}$ .

Lemma:  $0 \leq h < 1$  a.e. wrt.  $\mu$ , hence  $0 \leq f < \infty$  a.e. wrt.  $\mu$ .  $\square$

Set  $\mu_f(A) := \int_A f d\mu$ , so want to show  $\mu_f = \lambda$ .

$$(2) \Leftrightarrow \int_X g d\lambda - \int_X h g d\lambda = \int_X g(1-h) d\lambda = \int_X h g d\mu \stackrel{(3)}{=} \int_X h g d\mu \quad \forall g \in L^1(X, \lambda + \mu)$$

Now for  $A \subseteq X$  measurable, set  $g := \frac{1}{1-h} \chi_A$ , so

$$\lambda(A) = \int_X \chi_A d\lambda = \int_X g(1-h) d\lambda \stackrel{(3)}{=} \int_X h g d\mu = \int_A f d\mu = \mu_f(A)$$

holds whenever  $\frac{1}{1-h} \chi_A \in L^1(X, \lambda + \mu)$ . NOT ALWAYS TRUE

$\sigma$ -finiteness  $\Rightarrow X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$  for  $X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots$  s.t.  $\lambda(X_n), \mu(X_n) < \infty$ .

Given  $A \subseteq X$ , let  $A_n := X_n \cap \{x \in A \mid 1-h(x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\} \subseteq A$ , so  
 $(\lambda + \mu)(A_n) < \infty$  &  $\frac{1}{1-h} \chi_{A_n} \leq n \Rightarrow \frac{1}{1-h} \chi_{A_n} \in L^1(X, \lambda + \mu) \Rightarrow$

$\lambda(A_n) = \mu_f(A_n)$ . Let  $A_0 := A \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ , so  $A = A_0 \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$   
disjoint union, nested seq.

Lemma  $\Rightarrow \mu(A_0) = 0, \Rightarrow \mu_f(A_0) = 0$

$$\Rightarrow \mu_f(A) = \mu_f(A_0) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_f(A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_f(A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(A_n)$$

$$\lambda(A) = \lambda(A_0) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(A_n) = \lambda(A_0) + \mu_f(A)$$

We've proved: Under no assumption on  $\lambda$  &  $\mu$ ,  $\exists$  a distinguished measurable  
 fcn.  $f: X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  s.t.  $\forall A \subseteq X$  measurable,

$$\lambda(A) \geq \int_A f d\mu$$

Since  $\mu(A_0) = 0$ , if  $\lambda \ll \mu$ , then  $\lambda(A_0) = 0$   
 $\Rightarrow$  inequality becomes equality.  $\square$